

From: MsGee@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/10/01 3:25pm
Subject: microsoft settlement

In regards to the proposed settlement between the United States and Microsoft Corporation, I find that it is of some note that it appears from reading that the United States has the only right to withdraw it's consent to the Revised Proposed Final Judgement.

Secondly, as I felt from the beginning of the entire process, perhaps the United States is, for some unknown reason, afraid of Bill Gates and his "power" as in the amount of money the corporation has earned, therefore went after him and the company with a vengeance.

I only know that if the other companies had invested as much in R&D perhaps they too, would have been able to come up with some of the programs Microsoft has, was, and will be producing. Instead of whining about how Microsoft had a monopoly, they should have been busy re-investing their monies in trying to get to the same place in the computer/internet industry.

As to the nine states still trying to perhaps overrule the proposed accepted settlement, I think they are wasting the taxpayers time and money. After all, who are they to second guess the court and make another newer settlement proposal, while the court entertains the proposed settlement before it now.

I am of the opinion that the anti-trust laws are extremely out of date, antiquated, and need to be revised. The anti-trust laws, as they are today, do not adequately address technology in the slightest, especially at the rate it is advancing. I have only seen, a "supposedly" good law, one that is "supposed to protect" a company, end up to be rather one that does nothing but stifle creativity. And that is exactly the result of our anti trust laws as they exist today.

I see nothing wrong with someone being inventive or innovative and taking something beyond that of the "accepted" process or progress of a saleable item. That is a smart businessperson.

I understand that Microsoft Corp. put the pressure on manufacturers to use their products, and that Microsoft is being punished for doing that.

However, to be forced to give away codes, etc. is taking someone's inventive processes and is not only unfair, but an actual theft of intellectual property. So is that to be allowed?

If these other companies cannot figure out what Microsoft has figured out, they don't deserve to be in competition with any company.

If the other companies refuse to pay their employees the best wages possible, they have no right to complain about the progress that the Microsoft Corp. has made by hiring the best and paying good wages for their services.

If the other companies choose not to re-invest profits to allow the creation of innovative practices, they have no right to be in business, let alone right at all to complain about the business practices of another company.

All these other companies, still complaining, have yet to reach anywhere near where Microsoft has taken technology.

I question whether or not all of these complaining companies have even tried to match or even begun to try to meet the advances Microsoft has made in the

area of technology. That most likely has not occurred because they are too busy whining and complaining.

I do not believe that the government has the right or should ever have the right to make a company give up their intellectual property assets to make another company happy or allow them to compete in the market place on someone else's laurels..... I believe in free enterprise to the fullest possibility and that means government keeps hands off private business.

I had a political science teacher once say to my class that the "power is where the money is" and for all of us not to forget it, and it is this statement that keeps coming to mind these past few years. I realize now that for government, that may be a correct statement, but for our government to go after a corporation that is only in business to advance technology as we know it, the government has made a grave error in judgement. Bill Gates does not want to be president or anything else, for that matter, except who he is as we see him today. A man of great foresight, a man willing to put his money where his mouth is, and a man who wants nothing more but to make communication and life better for the citizens of the world.

In another vein, an example comes to mind. It is of some interest to me to note that in the United States there are many medical laboratories in every state, in most large cities. However, as an example of a monopoly, there is only one company in the entire United States that medically tests for allergy to latex. They charge whatever they want to charge, for that particular test and guess what? They get their fee! Is that a monopoly? What has stopped any other testing facility from performing that test? A citizen is forced to use only that particular laboratory located in Florida.

It would seem to me that since, this is only one particular example, there are surely, many other examples just in that particular industry alone. My guess is that it's expensive to set that testing up in a lab and therefore other labs just don't bother to re-invest their earnings and offer that service. They probably figure that since there's already one lab performing that test, no more are necessary. I would differ on that issue. There's no healthy competition there at all.

It's the same thing with the other technology companies who whine and complain that Microsoft has a monopoly .. They probably figured that since one company already had found ways to surpass them, they would just complain loudly and try to make that company share their inventive process. Why should they be rewarded?

And finally, since the government uses Microsoft products themselves, why haven't they switched to another company's products instead? We all know the answer to that question. The other company's products aren't that good. Why is that? Need I repeat the above comments?

I think the government has done a real "number" on one company who has outmanufactured all the other software companies. The government is responsible too, in a sense, for the tremendous loss of funds in the stock market in all fields of technology, which in turn hurt many citizens right in their pocketbook. Maybe the government thought that if they could cause that loss among consumers, that the consumers would side with the government and sway public opinion as to Microsoft products. Personally, I think that was a grave error on the part of the Justice Department.

I really wonder when this is all over, the court has made their decision, how long it will take the various technology companies to start complaining again as Microsoft continues their inventive processes.

I am very glad that Gates and Microsoft fought this battle. The life of technology depended on it! I hope too, that it taught the Justice Department a lesson.(Although i'm not sure they truly understand what lesson they have learned). In my mind, they had nothing else to do and therefore had to justify their jobs. I'll never feel any differently.

I think the Justice Dept. should go after other companies and encourage them, no.....force them to be competitive, especially companies like the medical testing labs mentioned above. That to me would certainly justify their jobs.

Maybe they should make that Florida lab share their work effort in the area of allergy testing. Then the consumer would be truly helped.

I am very anxious for the court to accept the proposed settlement and be done with this. I am also very anxious for the court to deny the nine states' separate proposal and get on with other more important issues that truly affect society at large.

Sincerely,

Lynnette Goldner

1164 South Wellesley Avenue

Los Angeles, CA 90049

310-207-5036